

Tense relations between logic and debate: Śāntarakṣita's solution of contradiction in the *Vādanyāya* *

SASAKI Ryō **

1. Introduction

Through the history of Indian thought, debate activities, including formulation of one's own argument and objection of an opponent's statement, were closely linked to logic, and logic was gradually systematized by Indian religious or philosophical sects over time. In fact, terms of logic, such as logical reason (*hetu*), are found in various texts dealing with debate (*vāda*, *vigraha*) as an object of study.¹ Therefore, to have a profound understanding of the system of debate, we should examine the logic adopted by ancient scholars who systematize the rules and technical terms of debate. Conversely, we can see what kind of logic ancient scholars want to apply through studies on rules and technical terms of debate.

This insight is applicable to the *Vādanyāya* (VN),² which is Dharmakīrti's work on the concept of "the condition of defeat" (*nigrahassthāna*), or the rules that determine victory or defeat between a proponent and an opponent. Although the traditional condition of defeat was arranged systematically by Naiyāyikas, Dharmakīrti defines the same concept completely differently. To him, the condition of defeat is divided into two types: *asādhanaṅgavacana* (the condition of defeat for a proponent) and *adoṣodbhāvana* (the condition of defeat for an opponent). Research on these terms is also helpful for clarifying his comprehension of Buddhist logic.

Assuming that it is reasonable to presuppose that the system of debate depends on logic, it follows that philosophers who have different types of logic would set out different systems of debate. That idea also applies philosophers in the same religious sects, such as Dharmakīrti and Śāntarakṣita, both of whom are Buddhist. In fact, Śāntarakṣita sometimes reinterpreted Dharmakīrti's idea in the

* Part of this paper was read at the 16th World Sanskrit Conference, June 28–July 02, 2015, Bangkok, Thailand.

** My article can be found at <https://waseda.academia.edu/RyoSasaki>

¹ For instance, the concept of logical reason (*hetu*) is used in the *Carakasamhitā*. CaS 8.8.28: ... tau ca svasvapakṣahetubhiḥsvasvapakṣam sthāpayataḥ, parapakṣam udbhāvayataḥ, eṣa jalpaḥ. ... (In addition, both [disputants] establish their respective positions on the basis of logical reasons of their respective positions [and] point out [the fault in] the other's position. This is the wrangling (*jalpa*).) *Jalpa* is a kind of *vāda* in this context.

² For previous research on the *Vādanyāya*, see Chinchore [1988], Gokhale [1993], Much [1986], [1991] and Sasaki [2012], [2013a], [2013b], [2014a], [2014b].

Vādanyāyaṭīkā-vipaṇcitāṛthā (VA), one of the most significant commentaries on VN. However, little attention has been given to this point. Therefore, this paper serves as a comparative analysis of Dharmakīrti's and Śāntarakṣita's views on debatology and Buddhist logic.

2. Contradiction between the second and third interpretations of *asādhanaṅgavacana*

As the first step in the analysis, this paper will focus on the concept of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, i.e., the condition of defeat for a proponent. *Asādhanaṅgavacana* is the first type of the two conditions of defeat and is further divided into five types in VN.³ Among the five interpretations of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, the second and third interpretations appears to be inconsistent. Dharmakīrti describes the second interpretations as follows:

VN 17,4–8: athavā sādhyate tena pareṣāṃ apratīto 'rtha iti sādhanam trirūpahetuvacanasamudāyaḥ. tasyāṅgaṃ pakṣadharmādivacanam. tasyaikasyāpy avacanam asādhanaṅgavacanam. tad api vādino nigrahassthānam, tadavacane heturūpasyaivāvacanena siddher abhāvāt.

Alternatively, a means of proof (*sādhana*)⁴ is what proves a thing that is not known by others, [namely,] the set of statements expressing a logical mark satisfying the three characteristics.⁵ The element (*aṅga*)⁶ of it (i.e., a means of proof) is a statement expressing the property of a subject and so forth. Not stating any one of them (i.e., elements) is “not stating the element of a means of proof” (*asādhanaṅgavacana*). This is also⁷ a condition of defeat for a proponent. The reason is

³ According to Dharmakīrti's definition, there are two types of the condition of defeat (*nigrahassthāna*): *asādhanaṅgavacana* and *adoṣodbhāvana*. *Asādhanaṅgavacana* is further divided into five types. See more detail in Sasaki [2012], [2013a], and Table 1 in [2014b].

⁴ See VA 60,30–61,7: iha ca paryāye **sādhana**śabdaḥ karaṇasādhanaḥ. (Moreover, in this case (i.e., the case of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*), the word of *sādhana*, whose meaning is the same (as *sādhana* in the first interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*), is formed by [addition of the suffix *-ana* in the sense of] instrument.)

⁵ This is a definition of “inference for others” (*parārthānumāna*). See PVin III 1,3 (= NB 3.1): trirūpalingākhyānam parārtham anumānam. (The statement of the logical mark which has three characteristics is inference for others.)

⁶ See VA 61,7–8: iha **āṅga**śabdo 'vayavavacanah, pūrvasmin kāraṇavacana iti viśeṣah. (While the aforementioned [word of *aṅga*] is the word [whose meaning is] “the cause,” the word of *aṅga* is the word [whose meaning is] “the element” in this case (i.e., in the case of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*). [Meanings of the word of *aṅga*] are thus distinguished [according to the context].)

⁷ “Also” (*api*) implies that the first interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, which is explained in VN 1,6–9, is a condition of defeat for a proponent, as is the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*. See Sasaki [2012].

that when it (i.e., an element of a means of proof) is not stated, there is no establishment because the very characteristic of logical reason is not stated.

In this case, he notes that “not stating any one of three elements” is the condition of defeat for a proponent. In this second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, Dharmakīrti asserts that a proponent should state all three characteristics (*trirūpa*) of a logical reason—*pakṣadharmatā* (the first characteristic), *sapakṣe sattvam* (the second characteristic), and *vipakṣe ’sattvam* (the third characteristic)—when he intends to prove a thesis (*pratijñā*). However, in the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, he seems to offer a contrasting perspective:

VN 17, 9–15: athavā tasyaiva sādhanasya yan nāṅgaṃ pratijñopanayanigamanādi, tasyāsādhanaṅgasya sādhanavākya upādānaṃ vādino nigrahassthānam, vyarthābhīdhānāt. anvaya-vyatikrayor vā sādharṃyavati vaidharṃyavati ca sādhanaprayoga ekasyaivābhīdhānena siddher bhāvāt, dvitīyasyāsāmarthyam iti tasyāpy asādhanaṅgasyābhīdhānaṃ nigrahassthānam, vyarthābhīdhānād eva.

Alternatively, a thesis, an application, a conclusion, and so forth⁸ are not elements of the means of proof⁹ [that is to say, not elements of the set of statements expressing a logical mark satisfying the three characteristics]. Making mention of “what is not an element of a means of proof” (*asādhanaṅga*) in the inferential statement is a condition of defeat for a proponent because [it is] a useless reference. Instead [of this interpretation, another explanation is shown as follows], the second [reference] has no ability [to establish what is to be proven] because the reference to only one of [the two concomitances, i.e.,] the positive concomitance (*anvaya*) or the negative concomitance (*vyatikraya*) establishes [what is to be proven] in the formulation of proof that has similarity or dissimilarity. Therefore, even stating this also, that is, what is not the element of a means of proof (*asādhanaṅga*), is a condition of defeat because [it is] merely a useless reference.

The third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, that is, “stating what is not the element of a means of proof,” implies that a proponent should not state excess components of a logical argument

⁸ A thesis, an application, a conclusion are, respectively, the first, fourth, and fifth of five *aṅga* shown by Naiyāyikas. The word “*ādī*” might imply the Sāṃkhya’s ten *aṅga* and so on. See Much [1991: 40, n. 194–195].

⁹ VA 61,19: **tasyaiveti** trirūpavacanāsamudāyasya, **yan nāṅgaṃ** nāvayavaḥ. (“Just that” (*tasyaiva*) is the set of statements expressing a logical mark satisfying the three characteristics and “what is not *aṅga*” (*yan nāṅgaṃ*) is what is not an element.) The meaning of *sādhana* and *aṅga* in the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* is the same as the meaning in the second interpretation.

syllogism—such as a thesis (*pratijñā*), an application (*upanaya*), a conclusion (*nigamana*), and so forth¹⁰—or state excess logical concomitance—such as a second positive concomitance or a second negative concomitance. According to Dharmakīrti’s explanation, if a person refers to these excess components when he intends to prove a thesis, he is judged to be defeated.

Regarding this third interpretation, we must look more carefully into the point that a proponent who states a second positive concomitance or a second negative concomitance is to be defeated. The second positive or negative concomitance no longer has the ability to establish what is to be proven (*sādhya*) because the first has already established it. This point makes clear that the positive concomitance and the negative concomitance are considered logically equivalent in this case.

We encounter difficulties when we try to interpret the second and third interpretations of *asāadhanāṅgavacana* at the same time. We must consider the contradiction between these two interpretations because a proponent needs to state both the second and third characteristics of a logical reason in the context of the second interpretations, but he should not state the two characteristics of a logical reason in the context of the third interpretations if we regard the concepts of *anvaya* and *vyatireka* in the second interpretation as the second and third characteristics, respectively. Śāntarakṣita recognizes this contradiction between the two interpretations. His solution in VA will be examined later. The following section discusses how the problem can be solved in Dharmakīrti’s system of Buddhist logic.

3. Dharmakīrti’s thoughts on the second and third characteristics of logical reason

Dharmakīrti derives his interpretation of *nigrahasthāna* from his own system of Buddhist logic, just as Naiyāyikas’ definition is based on their own logic. In Dharmakīrti’s texts, the three characteristics of logical reason figures prominently in the thought of inference (*anumāna*).

In the second interpretation of *asāadhanāṅgavacana*, “not stating any one of the elements (i.e., the three characteristics of logical reason)” (*tasyaikasyāpy avacanam*) is the condition of defeat for a proponent. Here we must draw attention to Dharmakīrti’s expression “any one of.” Similar expressions can be seen in his other works.¹¹ This expression suggests that a proponent who attempts to make a

¹⁰ Dharmakīrti’s comprehension of this condition of defeat is the exact opposite of the Nyāya school’s understanding that a proponent should state five components (*pañcāvayava*), including a thesis, an application, and a conclusion, when he intends to prove a thesis.

¹¹ See PV IV 23: *anuktāv api pakṣasya siddher apratibandhataḥ / triṣv anyatamarūpasyaivānuktir nyūnatoditā //* (Even if a thesis is not stated, establishment [of probandum] is not prevented. Therefore, it is said that “not stating any one characteristic of the three [characteristics of logical reason]” is

proof has to state all three characteristics of logical reason. In this case, however, the second and third characteristics should not be restricted by the particle *eva*.¹² If these two characteristics were restricted by *eva*, the second characteristic restricted by *eva* and the third characteristic restricted by *eva* would become logically equivalent so that, according to Dharmakīrti, as in the case of the third interpretation of *asāadhanāṅgavacana*, only one of the two characteristics should be stated, and the second one should not be stated because it is useless. Dharmakīrti explains his notion in the *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti* (PVSV):

PVSV 18,15–19 ad k.28:

tenaiva jñātasambandhe dvayor anyataroktitaḥ /
arthāpattyā dvitīye 'pi smṛtiḥ samupajāyate //28//

yad āha arthāpattyā vānyatarenaḥobhayapradarśanād iti. tatrāpi dṛṣṭāntena tadbhāvaḥhetubhāva-
pradarśanam manyamāno 'rthāpattyaikavacanena dvitīyasiddhim āha.

Because of the very reason [that the relationship between probans and probandum is clarified by either a homologous example or a heterologous example], when the relationship is already known [in either one of the two examples], the second [example] is also reminded through implication (*arthāpatti*) based on the statement of either one of the two (i.e., the homologous example and the heterologous example).

[In the *Nyāyamukha*¹³, Dignāga] says, “Or again, both [of the two examples] are shown by either one of the two [examples] through implication.” Here also (i.e., in the *Nyāyamukha*), [Dignāga], who considers that the relation of being something (*tadbhāva*) or the relation of being a cause (*hetubhāva*) is shown by an example, says that the second (i.e., the other) [example] is established by stating either one [of the two examples] through implication.

“insufficiency.”); PVin III 10,7–8 ad k.5: tenānuktāv api pakṣasya siddher apratibandhāt triṣv anyatamarūpasyaivānuktir nyūnatāsāadhanadoṣa ity uktam veditavyam. (Thus, even if a thesis is not stated, establishment [of probandum] is not prevented. Therefore, one should know it is said that not stating any one characteristic of the three [characteristics of logical reason] is “insufficiency,” which is a fault of the means of proof.); NB 3.55: trirūpaliṅgākhyānam parārthānumānam ity uktam / tatra trayāṇām rūpāṇām ekasyāpi rūpasyānuktau sādhanābhāsaḥ // (It is said that the statement of the logical mark which has three characteristics is an inference for the others. In this case, not stating even one characteristic of the three characteristics [of logical reason] is the pseudo means of proof.)

¹² For the three characteristics of logical reason and the particle *eva*, see Kajiyama [1966] and Katsura [1986].

¹³ See Watanabe [2003: I–123] for details.

Referring to Dignāga's thought, Dharmakīrti asserts that the second illustration of a similar example and a dissimilar example is unnecessary because it is implied by the first example. That is to say, he suggests that either one of the second or third characteristics is sufficient for the comprehension of the relationship between probans and probandum.

However, Dharmakīrti would probably claim that they have their own roles in a different context, as Katsura [1983: 540] explains: "It (i.e., *anvaya-vyatireka*) expresses an inductive process of discovering proper evidence and establishing a logical nexus. For this purpose, the restriction by *eva* is not necessary. *Anvaya* and *vyatireka* have their own *raison d'être* and are not logically equivalent."¹⁴ Dharmakīrti further explains his intention in the *Hetubindu*:

HB 34*,12–35*,1: *anvayavyatirekayor api tarhi na prthaktvam, ekasya prayogād ubhayagater iti cet, na, hetoḥ sapakṣāsapakṣayor bhāvābhāvayor aparasparākṣepāt; ekaṃ vākyam ubhayam gamayatīty ucyate, naiko 'rtho dvitīyasya. nanu tatraiva bhāvo tadabhāve⁽¹⁾ cābhāva iti vākye parasparākṣepa iti cet, vacanam etad ekasyāpi niyamakhyāpakasya dvitīyākṣepanāntarīyakatvāt sāmāthyād ubhayam ākṣipati. na punaḥ kevalau bhāvābhāvāv ākṣipataḥ; niyamavantau ca na kevalau, niyamasyobhayarūpatvāt. tasmāt tatraiva bhāva iti na bhāva evocyate, itareṇāpi nābhāva eva, yena bhāvo 'bhāvo vā dvitīyam ākṣipet.*

⁽¹⁾ *tadabhāve em.: 'tadabhāve HB.*

(Objection) In this case, positive concomitance and negative concomitance are not separated. Both [of the two concomitances] are understood through the employment of either one [concomitance]. (Answer) No, [that is not correct]. Logical reason's existence and non-existence in similar things and dissimilar things do not imply each other. [We] say, "one sentence [of the two sentences, i.e., logical reason's existence and non-existence in similar things and dissimilar things] makes [a person] understand both [sentences]," [but] the meaning of one side is not [the same as the meaning of] the second (i.e., the other side). (Objection) Do not the two sentences, that is, "[logical reason] exists only there (i.e., where similar things exist)" and "[logical reason] does not exist where they (i.e., similar things) do not exist" imply each other? (Answer) Because only one [of the two sentences] that declares restriction (*niyama*) indispensably implies the second (i.e., the other side), so this statement, [that is, either one of the two sentences mentioned above] indirectly implies both [the two sentences]. However, mere existence and non-existence (i.e., the sentences that do not declare restriction) do not imply [each other]. Moreover, [existence and non-existence],

¹⁴ This quotation is stated as explanation of *anvaya-vyatireka* theory of Dignāga by Prof. Katsura but, in my opinion, this understanding is also applicable to the case of *anvaya-vyatireka* theory of Dharmakīrti.

which are restricted is not [the same as] mere [existence and non-existence] because restriction is the nature of both [of existence and non-existence, which have restrictions]. Therefore, mere “existence” is not stated [even though] “[logical reason] exists only there” [is stated], [and] mere “non-existence” is not [stated], even though the other side, [i.e.,] “logical reason definitely does not exist there,” [is stated]. If [mere existence and non-existence were stated in those cases], existence or non-existence would imply the second [that is, mere non-existence or existence, respectively].

Identifying *anvaya* and *vyatireka* with the second and third characteristics of logical reason, Dharmakīrti distinguishes “*anvaya* restricted by *eva*” from “*anvaya* without the restriction of *eva*.” The same is true for *vyatireka*. He proposes that a person who uses *anvaya* with the *eva* restriction in the formulation does not have to employ *vyatireka* (with the *eva* restriction) and vice versa, but both *anvaya* without the *eva* restriction and *vyatireka* without the *eva* restriction should be used in the formulation because they are not logically equivalent. These *anvaya* and *vyatireka* are arranged in Table 1.

Table 1. *anvaya-vyatireka* with or without *eva*

<i>anvaya</i> with <i>eva</i> -restriction	“Logical reason exists only in similar examples.”
<i>anvaya</i> without <i>eva</i> -restriction	“Logical reason exists in similar examples.”
<i>vyatireka</i> with <i>eva</i> -restriction	“Logical reason definitely does not exist in dissimilar examples.”
<i>vyatireka</i> without <i>eva</i> -restriction	“Logical reason does not exist in dissimilar examples.”

In Dharmakīrti’s system of logic, contradiction between the second and third interpretations of *asādhanaṅgavacana* can be solved by distinction of *anvaya* and *vyatireka* with *eva*-restriction and *anvaya* and *vyatireka* without *eva*-restriction.¹⁵ If it is assumed that *anvaya* and *vyatireka* with *eva*-restriction are used in the context of the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, we can be satisfied with Dharmakīrti’s explanation that the reference of the second *anvaya* or *vyatireka* is useless. At the same time, if we assume that *anvaya* and *vyatireka* without *eva*-restriction are taken into consideration when the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* is explained, we can be satisfied that Dharmakīrti asserts that a proponent has to state both the second and third characteristics of logical reason.

Thus we tentatively explain the problem of the definition of *nigrahasthāna* in Dharmakīrti’s system.¹⁶ However, Śāntarakṣita’s solution is more drastic and sophisticated in some regards.

¹⁵ As for the problem between *anvaya* and *vyatireka* or the second and third characteristics of logical reason in the Buddhist logic, Katsura [1986: 104] outlines Dharmakīrti’s point on the problem briefly.

¹⁶ According to Katsura [1983: n. 22], “Dharmakīrti, even with his *eva*-restricted *tarirūpya* formulae,

4. Śāntarakṣita's reinterpretation of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*

Śāntarakṣita recognizes the contradiction between the second and third interpretations of *asādhanaṅgavacana* and presents a different solution than Dharmakīrti. In the *Vipaṇcitārthā*, the commentary on the *Vādanyāya*, Śāntarakṣita reinterprets Dharmakīrti's idea of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* as follows:

VA 61,10–15 ad VN 17,4–8: tat katham **tasyaikasyāpy avacanam asādhanaṅgavacanam** ity etam na vakṣyamāṇe vyāhatam iti. etac ca naivam eva hi vyākhyāyate. trirūpo hetur arthātmakaḥ paramārthato 'vasthitaḥ, tasya vacane ye prakāśake pakṣadharmavacanasapakṣasattvavacane pakṣadharmavacanavipakṣāsattvavacane⁽¹⁾ vā, tayos samudāyaḥ. tasya vacanadvayasamudāyasāṅgam pakṣadharmādivacanam iti. pakṣadharmavacanam⁽²⁾ tāvad avicalam, itarayos⁽³⁾ tv anyatarā-nyatarat kādācitkam.

⁽¹⁾ pakṣadharmavacanasapakṣasattvavacane pakṣadharmavacanavipakṣāsattvavacane VAMS em. [P₁ 75a7–8, P₂ 123a7–8, D 99a1: gsal bar byed pa phyogs kyi chos brjod pa dang mthun pa'i phyogs la yod par brjod pa 'am / phyogs kyi chos brjod pa dang / mi mthun pa'i phyogs la med par brjod pa nyid do //] : pakṣadharmavacanam sapakṣasattvavacane pakṣadharmavacanam vipakṣasattvavacane VA. ⁽²⁾ °vacanam VAMS em. [P₁ 75a8, P₂ 123a8, D 99a2: tshig ni] : °vadanam VA. ⁽³⁾ itarayos VAMS em.: itarayoh VA.

(Objection) Why is it not contradictory to what will be said [later] (i.e., the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*) that not stating any one of them (i.e., elements) is “not stating the element of a means of proof” (*asādhanaṅgavacana*)? (Answer) [There is no contradiction] because it is explained in detail [here] that it (i.e., the interpretation that not stating any one of elements is “not stating the element of a means of proof”) is never so (i.e., contradictory to what will be said later). It is truly established that logical reason that fulfills the three characteristics [for the correct reason] has as an essential property a fact [that has not yet been known by other people and remains to be proven]. The two [types of] statements, that is, the explanation of it (i.e., the logical reason that fulfills the three characteristics for the correct reason) are as follows: (1) the statement of [the characteristic that the logical reason is] the property of the topic (i.e., the first characteristic

treats pseudo-*liṅgas* in the same way as Dignāga, which suggests that Dharmakīrti has not completely expelled the inductive character from his system of logic.” That is to say, according to Katsura, Dharmakīrti “consider[s] the case when *liṅga* has the second *rūpa*, but not the third, and vice versa” even though *anvaya* and *vyatireka* are restricted by the particle *eva* and regarded as logically equivalent as well as Dignāga considers so. Given that Dharmakīrti is just confused about his own system of logic, the contradiction between the second and third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* cannot be solved.

of the three characteristics) and the statement of [the characteristics that the logical reason] exists in similar instances (i.e., the second characteristic of the three characteristics), or (2) the statement of [the characteristic that the logical reason is] the property of the topic (i.e., the first characteristic of the three characteristics) and the statement of [the characteristic that the logical reason] does not exist in dissimilar instances (i.e., the third characteristic of the three characteristics). The “set” (*samudāya*) [means the set] of these two [statements]. The elements (*aṅga*) of this set of the two statements are statements such as “[the logical reason is] the property of the topic” and so on. First, the statement of [the characteristic that the logical reason is] the property of the topic (i.e., the first characteristic of the three characteristics) is immovable. However, [either] one or the other of the other two characteristics (i.e., the second and third characteristics of the three characteristics) are occasionally [used as necessary].

Śāntarakṣita apparently regards the second and third characteristics as logically equivalent, thinks that a proponent need not state both characteristics in the formulation, and therefore considers Dharmakīrti’s understanding of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* problematic.

Contrary to Dharmakīrti’s perspective, Śāntarakṣita reinterprets the concept of *sādhana*, i.e., *samudāya*, in the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* to avoid the above-mentioned contradiction. Although Dharmakīrti rephrases *sādhana* as *trirūpahetuvacanasamudāya* and then interprets *samudāya* as the set of the three characteristics of logical reason, Śāntarakṣita gives the concept of *samudāya* a whole new meaning: the set of the first and second characteristics of logical reason or the set of the first and third characteristics of logical reason. It follows from Śāntarakṣita’s reinterpretation of the concept of *samudāya* that a proponent need not state all of the three characteristics of a logical reason but has to state both the first and second characteristics or both the first and third characteristics, although Dharmakīrti takes the position that a proponent should state all three characteristics.

Śāntarakṣita’s interpretation resolves inconsistencies in the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* which needs a proponent to state all three characteristics. We can also remark that Śāntarakṣita shifts the second and third characteristics without *eva* to the second and third characteristics with the restriction of *eva* in the context of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*. The differences between Dharmakīrti’s and Śāntarakṣita’s views on the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Dharmakīrti's and Śāntarakṣita's views on the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*

	Dharmakīrti's original idea	Śāntarakṣita's reinterpretation
<i>sādhana</i>	= set of the following elements: <i>pakṣadharmatā</i> (the first characteristic) <i>sapakṣe sattvam</i> (the second characteristic) <i>vipakṣe 'sattvam</i> (the third characteristic)	= set (1) of the following elements: <i>pakṣadharmatā</i> (the first characteristic) <i>sapakṣa eva sattvam</i> (the second characteristic)
		= set (2) of the following elements: <i>pakṣadharmatā</i> (the first characteristic) <i>vipakṣe 'sattvam eva</i> (the third characteristic)
<i>aṅga</i>	= an element of the above set	= an element of set (1) or set (2)

5. Concluding remarks

In Dharmakīrti's second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*, the second characteristic of logical reason should not be identified with the third characteristic. If he thought that they were logically equivalent, the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana* would have overlapped with the third interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*. However, in the latter half of VN (pp. 25–68), Dharmakīrti criticizes the overlapping of different *nigrahasthāna* which Naiyāyikas defined. Hence, in this context, he could not have identified the second characteristic of logical reason with the third characteristic.

Śāntarakṣita reconsiders Dharmakīrti's definition of the second interpretation of *asādhanaṅgavacana*. He reinterprets the concept of *sādhana*, i.e., *samudāya*, in order to make Dharmakīrti's original text consistent with the idea of identifying the second characteristic of logical reason with the third characteristic of logical reason because he regards Dharmakīrti's logical differentiation between the second and third characteristics as problematic.

Śāntarakṣita's interpretation is sophisticated, but Dharmakīrti's original view can be consistent and significant in its own right. We can grasp here the tense relationship between logic and debate through examining their thoughts. According to the different types of logic, concepts in the theory of debate are variously defined, such as by Dharmakīrti and Śāntarakṣita.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

1. Primary Sources

- CaS *Carakasamhitā* (Caraka): ed. Vaidya Jadavaji Trikamji Acharya, *Carakasamhitā of Agniveśa, elaborated by Caraka and Dṛḍhabala, with the Āyurveda-Dīpikā Commentary by Cakrapāṇidatta*, Chaukhamba Surbharati Prakashan, Varanasi, 2008.
- D Derge edition of Tibetan Tripitaka: eds. J. Takasaki, Z. Yamaguchi and Y. Ejima, *Sde Dge Tibetan Tripiṭaka Bstan Hgyur, preserved at the Faculty of Letters, University of Tokyo*, Sekai-Seiten-Kankō-Kyōkai, Tokyo, 1977–1989.
- HB *Hetubindu* (Dharmakīrti): ed. Ernst Steinkellner, *Dharmakīrti's Hetubinduḥ, Teil I, tibetischer Text und rekonstruierter Sanskrit-Text*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 252. Band, 1. Abhandlung, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, Heft 4, Herman Böhlau Nachf., Wien, 1967.
- NB *Nyāyabindu* (Dharmakīrti): Dalsukhabhai Malvania, *Paṇḍita Durveka Miśra's Dharmottarapradīpa: Being a sub-commentary on Dharmottara's Nyāyabinduṭīkā, a commentary on Dharmakīrti's Nyāyabindu*, Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series Vol. 2, Kashi prasad Jayaswal Research Institute, Patna, 1955.
- P Peking edition of Tibetan Tripitaka: ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking edition, Kept in the Library of the Otani University*, Kyoto, Reprinted under the supervision of the Otani University, Kyoto, 168 vols., Tibetan Tripitaka Research Institute, Tokyo - Kyoto, 1955–1961.
- PV IV The fourth chapter of the *Pramāṇavārttika* (Dharmakīrti): ed. Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana, *Ācārya-Dharmakīrteḥ Pramāṇavārttikam ācārya-Manorathanandikṛtayā vṛtṭyā samvalitam* (Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika* with a commentary by Manorathanandin), Appendix to J.B.O.R.S. Vols. 24–26, Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna, 1938–1940.
- PVin III The third chapter of the *Pramāṇaviniścaya* (Dharmakīrti): eds. Pascale Hugon and Toru Tomabechi, *Dharmakīrti's Pramāṇaviniścaya, chapter 3*, China Tibetology Publishing House and Austrian Academy of Sciences Press, Beijing - Vienna, 2011.
- PVSV *Pramāṇavārttikasvavṛtti* (Dharmakīrti): ed. Raniero Gnoli, *The Pramāṇavārttikam of Dharmakīrti, the first chapter with the autocommentary, text and critical notes*, Serie Orientale Roma 23, Istituto italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Rome, 1960.
- VA *Vipaṇcitārthā* (Śāntarakṣita): ed. Rāhula Sāṅkrīyāyana, *Dharmakīrti's Vādanyāya with the Comentary of Śāntarakṣita*, Appendix to J.B.O.R.S. Vols. 21 & 22, Bihar and Orissa Research

Society, Patna, 1935–36.

- VA_D *Vipaṇcitārthā* (Śāntarakṣita): ed. Svāmi Dvārikādās Śāstrī, *Vādanyāyaprakaraṇa of Āchārya Dharmakīrti with the commentary Vipaṇcitārthā of Āchārya Śāntarakṣita and Sambandhaparīkṣā with the commentary of Āchārya Prabhācandra*, Bauddha Bharati Series Vol. 8, Varanasi, 1972.
- VA_{MS} *Vipaṇcitārthā* (Śāntarakṣita): Photostat copy of the Sanskrit manuscript in the library of Georg-August-Universität Göttingen (The color photostat copies of the same manuscript: 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, 6a is included in 尼瑪旦增編, 『羅布林卡珍藏文物輯選』, 中国藏学出版社, 2011).
- VN *Vādanyāya* (Dharmakīrti): ed. Michael Torsten Much, *Dharmakīrtis Vādanyāyah, Teil I, Sanskrit-Text, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 581. Band, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien Nr. 25*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien, 1991.
- VN_D *Vādanyāya* (Dharmakīrti): See VA_D.
- VN_{MS} *Vādanyāya* (Dharmakīrti): Photostat copy of the Sanskrit manuscript in the National Archives of Nepal.
- VN_R *Vādanyāya* (Dharmakīrti): See VA.

2. Secondary Sources

Chinchore, Mangala R.

[1988] *Vādanyāya: A Glimpse of Nyāya-Buddhist Controversy*, Sri Satguru Publications, Delhi.

Gokhale, Pradeep P.

[1993] *Vādanyāya of Dharmakīrti: The Logic of Debate*, Sri Satguru Publications, Delhi.

[1997] *Hetubindu of Dharmakīrti: A Point of Probans*, Sri Satguru Publications, Delhi.

Kajiyama, Yūichi (梶山雄一)

[1966] 「仏教哲学における命題解釈 — eva の文意制限機能」, 『印度学仏教学論集: 金倉博士古稀記念』, 平楽寺書店, 京都, pp. 423–438. (“Bukkyō tetsugaku ni okeru meidai kaishaku: eva no bun-i seigen kinō,” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku ronshū: kanakura hakushi koki kinen*, Heirakuji shoten, Kyoto, pp. 423–438.)

Katsura, Shōryū (桂紹隆)

[1983] “Dignāga on Trairūpya,” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 178–182.

- [1986] 「インド論理学における遍充概念の生成と発展——チャラカ・サンヒターからダルマキールティまで」, 『広島大学文学部紀要』45, 特輯号 1. (“Indo ronrigaku ni okeru henjū gainen no seisen to hatten: *Carakasamhitā* kara Dharmakīrti made,” *Hiroshima daigaku bungakubu kiyō*, Vol. 45, Tokutengō 1pp. 69–90.) [“The Origin and Development of the Concept of *Vyāpti* in Indian Logic: from the *Carakasamhitā* upto Dharmakīrti,” *The Hiroshima University studies, Faculty of Letters*, Vol. 45–1, pp. 69–90.]

Kitagawa, Hidenori (北川秀則)

- [1965] 『インド古典論理学の研究——陳那 (Dignāga) の体系——』, 鈴木学術財団, 東京. (*Indo-koten-ronrigaku no Kenkyū: jinna (dignāga) no taikei*, Suzuki-gakujutsu-zaidan, Tokyo.) [A study of Indian Classical Logic: Dignāga's system, Suzuki Research Foundation, Tokyo.]

Much, Michael Torsten

- [1986] “Dharmakīrti's Definition of “Points of Defeat” (*Nigrahasthāna*),” *Buddhist Logic and Epistemology*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht / Boston / Lancaster / Tokyo, pp.133–142.
- [1991] *Dharmakīrtis Vādanāyāḥ, Teil II, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 581. Band, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasien Nr. 25, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Wien.

Sasaki, Ryō (佐々木亮)

- [2012] 「ダルマキールティの *nigrahasthāna* 解釈 (1) ——*asādhānāṅgavacana* について——」, 『久遠—研究論文集—』3, pp. 69–90. (“Dharmakīrti no *nigrahasthāna* kaishaku (1): *asādhānāṅgavacana* ni tsuite,” *Kuwon: kenkyū ronbun shū*, Vol. 3, pp. 69–90.) [“Dharmakīrti's interpretation of *nigrahasthāna* (1): On *asādhānāṅgavacana*,” *Kuwon: Research papers*, Vol. 3, pp. 69–90.]
- [2013a] 「ダルマキールティの *nigrahasthāna* 解釈 (2) ——*adoṣodbhāvana* について——」, 『久遠—研究論文集—』4, pp. 55–75. (“Dharmakīrti no *nigrahasthāna* kaishaku (2): *adoṣodbhāvana* ni tsuite,” *Kuwon: kenkyū ronbun shū*, Vol. 4, pp. 55–75.) [“Dharmakīrti's interpretation of *nigrahasthāna* (2): On *adoṣodbhāvana*,” *Kuwon: Research papers*, Vol. 4, pp. 55–75.]
- [2013b] “*Nigrahasthāna* in the *Vādanāyā*: Controversy between Dharmakīrti and the Nyāya School,” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* Vol. 61, No. 3, pp. 178–182.
- [2014a] 「ダルマキールティによる討論思想の体系化——*Vādanāyā* におけるニヤーヤ学派説の批判と受容——」, 『南アジア古典学』9, pp. 319–370. (“Dharmakīrti ni yoru

tōron-shisō no taikeika: *Vādanyāya* ni okeru Nyāya-gakuha no hihan to juyō,” Minami Ajia Kotengaku, Vol. 9, pp. 319–370.) [“Systematization of the Thought of Debate by Dharmakīrti: Criticism and Acceptance of the Nyāya School’s Theory in the *Vādanyāya*,” *South Asian Classical Studies*, Vol. 9, pp. 319–370.]

- [2014b] “*Acceptance and interpretation of Dharmakīrti’s theory of nigrāsthāna in the Nyāyamañjarī*,” *Kuwon: Research papers*, Vol. 5, pp. 40–62.

Steinkellner, Ernst

- [1967] *Dharmakīrti’s Hetubinduḥ, Teil II, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, 252. Band, 2. Abhandlung, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Süd- und Ostasiens, Heft 5, Herman Böhlau Nachf., Wien.
- [2013] *Dharmakīrti’s frühe Logik : Annotierte Übersetzung der logischen Teile von Pramāṇavārttika I mit der Vṛtti, I: Introduction, Übersetzung, Analyse & II: Introduction, Anmerkungen, Anhänge etc.*, Studia philologica Buddhica, monograph series 29, International Institute for Buddhist Studies of the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies, Tokyo.
- [2014] *The Edition of Śāntarakṣita’s Vādanyāyaṭīkā Collated with the Kundeling Manuscript*, Wiener Studien zur Tibetologie und Buddhismuskunde Heft 82, Arbeitskreis für Tibetische und Buddhistische Studien Universität Wien, Wien.

Watanabe, Toshikazu (渡辺俊和)

- [2003] 「ダルマキールティ推理論の研究」, 学位論文 (於広島大学). (“Dharmakīrti suiron no kenkyū,” dissertation at Hiroshima University.)

(SASAKI Ryō – Lecturer, Waseda University, Ph.D.)